DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 944 TM 018 122

AUTHOR Austin, Susan; McCann, Richard
TITLE "Here's Another Arbitrary Grade for Your Collection": A Statewide Study of Grading Policies.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 92
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Policy; *Evaluation Criteria; Grades (Scholastic); *Grading; High Schools; High School Students; *School Districts; School Surveys; Staff Development; *State Surveys; *Student Evaluation; Testing Programs

ABSTRACT

In response to concerns about current grading policies and procedures, a study was undertaken to provide state leaders with descriptions of grading policies and procedures across high schools. A total of 144 districts (out of 292 in the state that was the focus of this study) responded. Documents provided by the districts varied according to district, but included materials from school board, district administration, school, and department levels. Analysis covered the following: (1) purposes of grades; (2) audiences for grades; (3) criteria for calculating grades; (4) grading-related practices; (5) directive nature of school board policies; (6) amount of building-level guidance on grading practices; and (7) staff development. There was considerable variation across the districts, although documents from several districts did not clearly indicate what criteria should be used in determining grades and how those criteria should be applied. Few districts appeared to give teachers adequate guidance to ensure consistent grading, and no district provided information about staff development to improve grading. It appears that most systems develop policies and procedures that attempt to achieve all purposes for all stakeholders, and consequently achieve none very well. Six tables present study findings, and one figure illustrates multiple grading criteria. A 12-item list of references and four appendices with supplemental information about policies are included. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

PETER J. DONAHOE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"HERE'S ANOTHER ARBITRARY GRADE FOR YOUR COLLECTION": A STATEWIDE STUDY OF GRADING POLICIES

by

Susan Austin
Richard McCann

March, 1992

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 574-9300

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"HERE'S ANOTHER ARBITRARY GRADE FOR YOUR COLLECTION": A STATEWIDE STUDY OF GRADING POLICIES

By

Susan Austin
Richard McCann

March, 1992

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 574-9300

Paper to be presented at the anuual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 23, 1992.

The preparation of this paper was partly supported by funds for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education Research and Improvement (OERI). The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of OERI, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

This study was undertaken in response to concerns about current grading policies and procedures in the schools, expressed by state leaders in one northeast state involved in an educational reform effort. At one level, they were concerned about the extent to which grades were a valid and reliable description of student achievement, descriptions that could inform critical educational decisions like promotion, placement, participation in extra curricular activities, and admission to post-secondary education programs and institutions. At another level, they were concerned that current grading policies and practices were in conflict with their efforts to move education toward becoming a system that would ensure that all students acquired the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and habits needed for future learning and for productive adulthood.

The purpose of this study was to provide state leaders with descriptions of current grading policies and procedures. To make the study feasible within available resources, it was decided to focus on policies and procedures that affected the grading practices of high school teachers of English and mathematics. The question that was used to structure the study was: How do local policies and procedures vary with respect to:

- the purposes for grades
- the audiences for grades
- the criteria for calculating grades
- expected grading-related practices
- board, school, and departmental directives and guidance
- staff development regarding grading practices?

Orientation

Evaluation is central to schooling and to teaching. In order to learn, students need regular feedback on how they are doing. In order to provide active support for their child's learning, parents need similar feedback. In order to plan lessons that build from where students are, teachers need information about what their students know and can do. All three also like to have comparative information: How does a particular student do in comparison to other students in his or her class?

Grading systems are "shorthand" languages for communicating evaluative information about students. The meaningfulness of grades depends on the extent to which a school community has a shared understanding of what they stand for. This study is thus an investigation into the extent to which particular districts and schools have stated in their grading policies and procedures such a shared understanding. It also is an investigation into the differences of the grading systems that have evolved across a group of high school districts.

Related Research

This study builds on the following three lines of research: variability of grading practices, the predictive validity of grades, and the status of teacher preparation and training with regard to evaluation and grading.

Studies by Clough, Davis and Sumner (1964), Evans (1976), Terwilliger (1977), Traub (1988), Leiter and Brown (1983), and Shavelson and Stern (1981) have documented the variability in teachers' grading practices. Explanations for this variability include: teachers may attribute varying degrees of importance and purpose to the grading process, apply varying standards, select arbitrary criteria in assigning grades, and assign grades according to preferences for certain student attitudes and behaviors (e.g., compliance and involvement).

Studies by Evans (1976), Hotchkiss, Bishop, and Gardner (1982), Kang and Bishop (1984) have explored the extent to which grades can predict how a student will perform in future courses or in work settings. This research indicates that grades are only moderately good predictors of future success in school and apparently bear little or no relation to future success beyond school.

Studies by Stiggins (1988), and Stiggins, Frisbie, and Griswold (1989) have determined that teachers, in general, lack training and preparation in designing and implementing appropriate grading strategies, and that their current grading practices are often at odds with the practices suggested by measurement specialists. Nevertheless, teachers may spend as much as 20-30% of their professional time directly involved in assessment-related activities.

Sample

In the state serving as the focus for this study, there are a total of 292 high school districts. With the assistance of the state department of education, copies of policies and procedures that might affect the grading practices of high school English and mathematics teachers were requested for each of these districts. In mailing the request, the following examples of materials would be of interest were named:

- excerpts from school board policy manuals
- district guidelines
- teacher handbooks
- departmental (math, English) guidelines.

Of the 292 districts, 144 (49 percent) responded to the request.

Methodology

To do an analysis of the content of the materials submitted, an initial reading of about one-third of the materials was undertaken, in order to identify both what topics were addressed and some of the different ways in which they were addressed. This information was used to create a coding sheet. After training, two readers independently coded each district's submissions. When their coding differed, they would reread as a team the submissions of concern, in order to determine the coding that most accurately reflected the content of the submissions.

The codings were then summarized using frequency counts and percentages.

Description of the Documents Analyzed

This study analyzed the content of documents provided by 144 school districts. The documents included excerpts from school board policy manuals, district guidelines and administrative directives, teacher handbooks or manuals, parent-student information handbooks, departmental guidelines and course descriptions. The actual materials provided varied by district. Some districts provided materials from all four organizational levels: board, district administration, school, and department; others provided materials from only one, two, or three of these levels. Specifically,

- 66 districts provided school board policies (46 percent)
- 50 districts provided district administrative guidelines (35 percent)
- 116 districts provided school-level guidelines and procedures (81 percent)
- 39 districts provided English department guidelines and procedures (27 percent)
- 37 districts provided mathematics department guidelines and procedures (26 percent).

There was no follow-up with the districts to confirm that they had submitted all documents relevant to their grading practices; therefore, the reader is cautioned against interpreting the lack of materials as meaning an absence of policies/guidelines at a particular organizational level.

Results of the Content Analysis

The content analysis of these documents covers the following seven topics: purposes of grades, audiences for grades, criteria considered in calculating grades, grading-related practices, directive nature of school board policies, amount of building-level guidance on grading practices, and nature of staff development. The results are presented by organizational levels (board, district, school, and department) where appropriate.

Purposes for Grades

Documents were reviewed for statements as to the purposes (goals) served by grades. Of the 66 board policy documents, 55 (83 percent) presented purpose-related statements, 20 of the 50 district administrative documents (40 percent) contained purpose-related statements, and 52 of the 116 school-level documents (45 percent) articulated purpose(s) for grades.

As seen in Table 1, five types of purpose statements were identified. The purpose statement most frequently presented at the board level described grades as providing information about student progress (82 percent). District and school level purpose statements are less likely to cite this purpose (40 and 38 percent, respectively). The following is an example of such a purpose statement, from a board policy manual, that was crafted to address state law.

> Evaluation procedures shall be developed and implemented to provide for the continuous and comprehensive review of pupil progress toward district and school goals and program objectives.

(INSERT TABLE 1 HERE)

The next most common purpose statement presented at the board level described grades as providing information for instructional planning (44 percent). Here too, district and school level purpose statements are less likely to cite this purpose (20 and 10 percent, respectively). The following is an example from a board policy of such a purpose statement:

> Grading shall be that system of measuring and recording student progress and achievement which enables the student, parents and teachers to: (a) learn the student's strengths and weaknesses; (b) plan an educational future for the student in the areas of the greatest potential for success; and (c) know where remedial work is required.

The third most common purpose statement presented at the board level described grades as providing information about a student's current level of achievement and/or performance (25 percent), as differentiated from "progress." In this instance, districts and schools are more likely than boards to cite this purpose for grades. Nine (45 percent) of the district documents contained this purpose statement, and 34 (65 percent) of the school documents cited this purpose. For these districts, an example of such a policy is as follows:

> The chief school administrator, in consultation with teaching staff, shall develop criteria for evaluation, indicators of achievement of the criteria, and acceptable standards of achievement for all grade levels, courses and programs offered by the district. The criteria, indicators and standard must be related to district goals and objectives.

> These standards of proficiency shall form the basis for the district's grading system. The specific indicators of achievement and standards of proficiency developed for all courses and programs accepted for credit toward high school graduation shall be given to pupils and parents/guardians, in writing at the time the pupil registers for the course.
>
> It is the intent of the Board to have grades earned by a student in a class accurately reflect the students' performance in that class.

The fourth purpose found in a few of the documents described grades as providing information for decision making -- information that would help school staff make decisions related to, for example, eligibility for extra-curricular activities, placement in level of course (e.g., advanced placement, college prep, general education), or promotion to the next grade level.

Finally, a few documents described grades as "motivators," "rewards," and "ways to discipline" -- for example, as one board policy manual said, "Students should work hard to master the subject and thus be awarded with appropriate grades," while others explicitly stated that grades should not be used as a disciplinary tool: "A student's behavior pattern is not to influence the academic grade rendered by a teacher. Discipline problems are handled in the variety of ways specified elsewhere in the teachers' manual. The purpose of a grade is an evaluation."

Audiences for Grades

The documents were reviewed for statements as to the primary audiences for grades. As shown in Table 2, parents were most frequently described as the primary audience by documents at each of the organizational levels (77 to 85 percent). Students followed as the second primary audience (54 to 76 percent). Teachers and other school-level decision makers were mentioned in 25 percent of the board policies, though less frequently in documents from the other organizational levels (10 percent). A few documents referred to other decision makers, such as higher education officers or employers.

(INSERT TABLE 2 HERE)

Criteria to Be Considered in Calculating Grades

The documents provided by the districts were analyzed to determine what criteria were recommended to teachers as the basis for calculating grades. Through that analysis, the following five criteria were identified:

- Student performance - statements that indicate that individual student performance on assignments, tests, quizzes, and homework should be taken into consideration when assigning a grade

- Class participation - statements that indicate that a student's work habits, record of homework completion, and preparation for class may be taken into consideration when assigning a grade

- Attendance - statements that indicate that a student's attendance record may be taken into consideration when assigning a grade

- Attitude - statements that indicate that a student's interest, extent of effort, ability to listen attentively, attempt to cooperate, and sense of responsibility may be taken into consideration when assigning a grade.

- Discipline - statements that indicate that a student's behavior (e.g., cutting class or suspensions) may be taken into consideration when assigning a grade

Emphasis on different criteria. The documents from three organizational levels (district, including board; school; and department) were analyzed separately in order to determine the emphasis that they played on each of the above criteria. Table 3 summarizes the results of those analyses. It shows that 90 of the 144 districts (63 percent) provided board policies or district guidelines that specified criteria to be used in determining grades, that 116 of the 144 districts (81 percent) provided school level documents that specified criteria, that 39 of the 144 districts (27 percent) provided English department documents that specified criteria, and that 37 of the 144 districts (26 percent) provided mathematics department documents that specified criteria.

(INSERT TABLE 3 HERE)

Table 3 shows that irrespective of organizational level, most documents (85 to 97 percent) specify student performance as the primary criteria for determining grades. It shows that classroom participation is the second most frequently mentioned criteria in documents from all levels; however, it most frequently appears in departmental documents (82 to 92 percent), in contrast to either district or school-level documents (30 to 38 percent). The other three criteria (attendance, attitude, and discipline are stated least frequently (3 to 23 percent).

Number of criteria used. The documents were also analyzed to determine how many criteria teachers were asked to consider, when they calculate grades. Only 15 of the 90 districts (17 percent) established student performance as the only criteria to be used in determining grades. An example of this follows:

> Grades are an evaluation of an individual's progress, not a judgment of a pupil's character or personality. Grades are not to be used as a method of reward or punishment. Grades are used to report educational progress and achievement...Students shall be graded compared to a fixed standard except when a student is judged not able to achieve the fixed standard. In those cases, students shall be graded according to how well they are meeting their prescribed educational needs and adjusted standards shall be reported.

In contrast, 75 of the 90 districts (83 percent) asked teachers to use multiple criteria in determining a grade. To illustrate this approach, the following excerpt is provided; it shows how one district defines what an "A"

means and what a "F" means in its grading system and the multiple criteria that are embedded within this statement of standards (Figure 1).

(INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE)

An alternative approach to a multi-criteria system was offered by one district. It created a two-grade system. The first grade, the "Academic Achievement Grade," describes a student's performance on academic tasks (e.g., in-class assignments and activities, performance in the laboratory, performance on quizzes and tests), relative to the performances of other students. The second grade, the "Individual Development Grade," describes the student's growth academically, socially, and behaviorally with respect to where the student was at the beginning of the class or course. With respect to the second grade, teachers are encouraged to consider a student's effort, interest, attitude, work habits, self-discipline and self-direction, and attendance. In calculating a student's grade point average, only the first grade is used.

Use of "intelligence" as a criterion. Though most documents did not suggest that intelligence or the "innate ability" of a student should be weighed in determining grades, one district did provide a policy that suggests that teachers should consider I.Q. in the determination of grades. The policy specifically offers the following "rules of thumb."

> There should be about as many marks of 3.5 or higher as there are pupils in a group with I.Q.'s of 120 or above. There should be about as many marks of F (1.0 to 1.5), as there are pupils with I.Q.'s of 95 or less. It is expected that the number of marks at the 3.5 level or higher, and at the 1.5 level or lower, many have a variance of 25 percent of the pupils in the I.Q. groups of 120 and up, and 95 and below.

Teachers are warned in the policy not to interpret this rule of thumb as indicating that any given pupil's marks must be given according to his or her I.Q. However, teachers are also urged, when they run into an atypical situation (e.g., a pupil who is performing above or below their "expected" level) to review the case with the coordinator or principal before marks are issued. According to the policy, the rationale for this approach to marks is "...to make sure that similar groups of pupils in various subjects are marked similarly by all teachers."

Variability of criteria within districts. As a final analysis, the documents of districts providing materials from all three organizational levels (71 of the 144 districts) were reviewed to determine the extent that they were consistent in their treatment of the question of criteria. The results of this analysis were as follows:

- 25 of the 71 districts (35 percent) provided documents from at least two organizational levels that were judged to treat the topic of criteria in a similar fashion

- 46 of the 71 districts (65 percent) provided documents from different organizational levels that treated the topic of criteria inconsistently. For example, the documents from different levels described different criteria, different numbers of criteria, and/or gave different emphasis to selected criteria.

Grading-Related Practices

The next analysis sought to describe the variability in the grading practices across the 144 districts. All of the documents provided by a district were searched in order to determine the number of marking periods, the symbol system used in reporting grades on report cards, the weight given final examinations in calculating the grade for a course, the numerical value of the passing grade for a course, and the method for calculating grade point average and class rank. Table 4 describes the extent to which districts provided information on each of these practices. The differences found regarding these practices are described below.

(INSERT TABLE 4 HERE)

Number of marking periods. Of the 144 districts, 130 (90 percent) provided information regarding the number of marking periods. The vast majority of these districts (98 percent) have four marking periods. One district's documents said that it had three marking periods, while two districts' documents said that they had six marking periods.

Grading system used for reporting grades on report cards. Of the 144 districts, 141 (92 percent) provided information on the symbol system they use for reporting grades on report cards. Letter grades were used by 110 of the 141 districts (78 percent). Of the 110,

- 80 (73 percent) use a simple system of letter grades on report cards, providing teachers four (A,B,C,F) or five (A,B,C,D,F) grading options

- 28 (25 percent) use pluses and/or minuses with the letters, providing teachers between eight (A+,A,B+,B,C+,C,D,F) and thirteen grading options (A+,A,A-,B+,B,B-,C+,C,C-,D+,D,D-,F)

- 2 (2 percent) use a simple system of letter grades, but provide a plus option with one letter grade (in one case, A+,A, and in the other, F+,F).

Thirty-one of the 138 districts (23 percent) use a numerical grading system on report cards. Of the 31,

- 25 (81 percent) describe their numerical grading system in terms of four or five bands (e.g., 90 to 100, excellent; 80 to 89, good; 70 to 79, satisfactory; below 70, failing). Interestingly, 14 of these 25 define their bands in even intervals; 11 define their bands in uneven intervals (e.g., 93 to 100, excellent; 84 to 92, good; 75 to 83, satisfactory; 70 to 74, passing; 0 to 69, failing).

- Three (10 percent) used numerical grading systems that did not involve bands.

- Two used a four-point number system (1 to 4).

- One used a 100-point scale, with 70 as passing.

Weight of final exam. Of the 144 districts, 99 (69 percent) provided information on how they weigh final examinations in the calculation of a student's grade for an entire course. Forty districts (40 percent) have set the exam as worth approximately one-fifth of the final grade. The other districts use these weights: one-third, one-fourth, one-sixth, one-eighth, one-ninth, one-tenth, or one-twelfth. Furthermore, among these 99 districts, 66 make no distinction between the value of a final exam in a semester or year-long course. However, 33 districts do make such a distinction, tending to assign a greater weight to the final exam in a semester course (e.g., one-fifth) than in a year-long course (e.g., one-tenth).

An example of the kind of directions for computing final grades in a year-long course is as follows: "The final average is determined by doubling the grade for each quarter, adding in the final exam grade, and dividing the total by nine."

Passing grade for a course. Of the 144 districts, 113 (78 percent) provided information on the numerical value they used as the passing grade for a course. (Note: Most districts with letter grade systems, also use a concurrent numberical system, in order to calculate grade point averages and class rank.)

Districts tend to use four different numerical values for passing. Among the 113 districts:

- 42 (37 percent) districts use 70 or above as their passing grade

- 36 (32 percent) districts use 60 or above as their passing grade

- 32 (28 percent) districts use 65 or above as their passing grade

- 3 (3 percent) districts use 69 or above as their passing grade.

Calculation of class standing or rank. Of the 144 districts, 70 (49 percent) provided information about how they calculated grade point average and class rank. Only six districts (9 percent) use a simple, unweighted calculating system. In these districts, grades in most courses count equally in calculating a student's grade point average and rank in class. An "A" in a basic-level, special-education, or honors level class has the same value.

Fifty-four districts (77 percent) in this sample use a system in which grades for some courses are weighted differently than grades in other courses. For example, in some districts, grades in higher level courses (e.g., an advanced placement science course) are weighted at a higher value than the same grades in a "regular" science course, when calculating grade point averages. In other districts, only grades in academic courses are used to calculate grade point averages.

Finally, ten districts (14 percent) operate a dual system of computing grade point averages: one system used for college admissions, and the other

system used for within district purposes such as selecting a valedictorian or honor society members.

The way that districts explain their system often reveals the complexity of the process they have to complete. The following district description illustrates this point:

> Student averages are to be calculated by multiplying credits attempted times the quality points earned for each course elected. The total quality points earned for the year divided by the credits attempted that year will give the yearly average. The total accumulated quality points divided by the total accumulated credits will give the student's accumulated average.

Directive Nature of School Board Policies

The 66 school board policies were analyzed to determine what kind of direction they provided on the following six topics: frequency of marking periods, the kind of symbols used in the grading system, the criteria to be used in determining grades, the timing and value of final exams, the effects of absences on grades, and the calculation of grade point average and class rank. The board policies with respect to each of these topics were coded as to whether the policy defined the practice, charged the superintendent and staff with the responsibility to define the practice, or failed to address the topic.

As summarized in Table 5, the three topics on which board policy was most likely to stipulate practice (38 to 42 percent) were: establishing frequency of marking period, establishing a symbol system, and defining grading components. The topics mentioned with the least frequency in board policy (17 to 20 percent) were: effects of absences on grade and computation of grade point average.

(INSERT TABLE 5 HERE)

Of the 66 policies, 58 provided highly specific direction on one or more of the topics. Of these 58 policies, 46 (79 percent) addressed one to three of the topics. Only 12 (21 percent) addressed four to six of the topics.

An example of the latter encompassed nearly nine, single-spaced pages (See Appendix A). It states that grading criteria should include comprehension of subject matter and skill development (as reflected in tests, quizzes, written and oral reports) and individual initiative (as reflected in homework, logs, journals and classroom participation). It describes how these criteria should be weighted and how to compute grades. It stipulates the conditions governing mid-year and final exams, standards for promotion, consequences of cheating, procedures for making-up credit deficiencies in summer school, calculation of class rank, and so on.

In contrast, a board policy providing minimal direction can be seen in Appendix B.

Amount of Building-Level Guidance on Grading Practices

The school and departmental documents were analyzed for the amount of guidance given to teachers regarding grading criteria, the value of the criteria in computing grades, and the procedures for computing grades. Analysis of documents at this level was based on the assumption that school and departmental level statements are likely to have a significant influence on practice because of their close proximity to the teacher. Each document was assigned a rating on a three-point scale. At one end of the scale are documents that provide clear and explicit directions: they define grading criteria, state the value of these criteria when computing the grade (e.g., completed homework counts for 20 percent of the grade), and provide formulas for computing grades on a fair and consistent basis. At the other end of the scale were those documents that made no mention of the criteria teachers should use in assigning grades and offered no guidance on how to compute grades. Documents that were determined to be midway between these two points generally had guidelines for how teachers should assign and compute grades, but did not require teachers to follow them.

Of the 144 districts, 116 provided school-level information that allowed for an analysis of the extent of guidance they provide to teachers. As seen in Table 6, very few of the schools provide highly directive guidelines. The majority appear to provide low and moderate levels (see Appendix C for an example of highly directive guidelines). However, at the departmental level the extent of guidance appears to be slightly greater; nevertheless, such guidance generally takes the form of suggestions.

(INSERT TABLE 6 HERE)

Staff Development Sessions on Grading Practices

Each district was asked to provide information about district or school-sponsored staff development sessions on grading policies and practices. Sixty four of the 144 districts submitted information. From the documents and descriptions provided, it appears that grading policies and practices were most often treated as an informational topic during a departmental, school, or district meetings. In general, the topics read:

- district or school grading policies
- how to compute grades
- how to fill out report cards (or computer forms for report card preparation)
- presentation of the distribution of the grades being given.

These districts did not present documents that suggested there was an in-depth discussion of the topic or that there was "training" to increase the consistency with which staff of the school or department determined grades.

Discussion of the Results

Though one must be cautious about generalizing beyond the 144 districts that submitted documents, it is clear that:

- there is considerable variation across these 144 districts regarding the content of their grading policies and procedures

- the documents of a significant number of those districts that provided information from various organizational levels (46 out of 71) failed to communicate a consistent picture of what criteria should be used in determining grades and how those criteria should be applied

- the documents of a significant number of those districts that provided information about criteria used in grading asked teachers to apply multi-criteria (75 out of 90), a practice that, according to Evans (1976), Terwilliger (1977), and Traub (1988), is apt to make grades less meaningful to students, parents, teachers, and administrators

- few of the 144 districts, schools, and departments provided direction that were specific enough to ensure some level of consistency in English or mathematics teachers' grading practices

- none of the 144 districts provided information about staff development being provided to help teachers" grade" with consistency.

Together, these results suggest possible reasons for the research finding that suggests that grades, at best, have moderate predictive validity and that for them to have such validity, they need to be accompanied by information like criteria used, weighting given alternative criteria, etc. (Evans, 1976; Hotchkiss, Bishop and Gardner, 1982; and Bishop, 1984).

Being more speculative, there may be more profound reasons for the variability and inconsistencies identified. First, grades, as a shorthand language for communicating evaluative information, can reflect conflicting views of the purpose of schooling.

- Those who see the primary job of schools to be helping students master certain knowledge and skills, want grades to define the current status of a students' achievement -- that is, its status against an explicit standard.

- Those who see the primary job of schools to be developmental -- that is, helping students to develop increasingly mature patterns of thought and behavior -- want grades to describe the effort and progress students are making.

- Those who see the primary job of schools to be providing multiple programs, that are responsive to individual students differences want grades to differentiate students and their performance from other members of their class, grade, or age group

Confounding these conflicts are the needs of different stakeholders (e.g., students, parents, teachers, counselors, employers, admission officers) for evaluative information in an economical form. They want, to varying degrees, information about the status of current achievement, about effort being made and development occurring, and about standing in comparison to the peer group.

In this context of conflicting purposes and varying needs, school systems try to develop grading policies and procedures. If our speculation is correct, most systems will develop policies and procedures which attempt to achieve all purposes for all stakeholders and, therefore, achieve none well. In this context, only a few school systems will develop clear, single-purpose grading systems. Few will develop multiple grading systems, each with its own integrity and each serving well a given purpose or need for evaluative information in a economical form.

REFERENCES

Clough, E. E., Davis, P., & Sumner, R. (1984). Assessing pupils: A study of policy and practice. Windsor, England: The NFER-Nelson Publishing Co.

Evans, F. B. (1976). What research says about grading. In Simon, S. S. & Bellance, J. A. (eds.). Degrading the grading myths: A primer of alternatives to grades and marks. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Hotchkiss, L., Bishop, J. H., & Gardner, J. (1982). Effects of individual and school characteristics on part time work of high school seniors. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Kang, S. & Bishop, J. H. (9184). The impact of curriculum on the non-college bound youth's labor market outcomes. In L. Hotchkiss, J. Bishop, & S. Kang (eds.), High school preparation for employment, (pp. 95-135). Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University, The National Center for Research in Vocation Education.

Leiter, J. & Brown, J. S. (1983). Sources of elementary school grading. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 135)

Shavelson, R. J. & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. Review of Educational Research, 41(4), 455-98.

Stiggins, R. J. (1988). Revitalizing classroom assessment: The highest instructional priority. Phi Delta Kappan, 69(5), 363-368.

Stiggins, R. J. & Bridgeford, N. (1985). The ecology of classroom assessment. Journal of Educational Measurement, 22(5), 271-86.

Stiggins, R. J. & Bridgeford, N. (1982). Final research report to the National Institute of Education on the nature, role, and quality of classroom performance assessment. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Stiggins, R. J., Frisbie, D. A. & Griswold, P. A. (1989). Inside high school grading practices: Building a research agenda. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 8(2), 5-14.

Terwillinger, J. S. (1977). Assigning grades - philosophical issues and practical recommendations. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 10(3), 21-39.

Traub, R., et al. (1988). Teacher assessment practices in a senior high school mathematics course (final report). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Table 1
Types of Board Goal/Purpose Statements

Types	Board (N=55) n	%	District (N=20) n	%	School (N=52) n	%
Provides information about student progress	45	(82)	8	(40)	20	(38)
Provides information for instructional planning	24	(44)	4	(20)	5	(10)
Provides information about student achievement/ performance	14	(25)	9	(45)	34	(65)
Provides information for decision making (e.g., promotion/retention, college admissions, jobs)	4	(7)	2	(10)	2	(4)
Others (e.g. grades as motivators)	4	(7)	3	(15)	5	(10)

Note: Each document may have more than one purpose coded.

Table 2
Target Audience

Audience	Level Board (N=55) n	%	District (N=20) n	%	School (N=52) n	%
Parents	47	(85)	16	(80)	40	(77)
Students	42	(76)	12	(60)	28	(54)
Teachers and school decision makers (for promotions, honors)	14	(25)	2	(10)	5	(10)
Higher education officers	3	(5)	2	(10)	5	(10)
Employers	3	(5)	1	(5)	4	(8)
Others (e.g., military)	1	(2)	0	(0)	0	(0)

Note: Each policy may have more than one target audience coded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Components of Grades, By Level

Levels	Student Performance		Classroom Participation		Attendance		Attitude		Discipline	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Board or District N=90 (63%)	79	(88)	27	(30)	14	(16)	8	(9)	3	(3)
School N=116 (81%)	99	(85)	44	(38)	17	(15)	18	(16)	3	(3)
English Department N=39 (27%)	38	(97)	32	(82)	9	(23)	7	(18)	1	(3)
Mathematics Department N=37 (26%)	36	(97)	34	(92)	5	(14)	4	(11)	2	(5)

Note: At each level, more than one component may be coded.

Table 4
Districts that Addressed Grading-Related Practices
(N=144)

Practices	Districts	
	n	%
Number of marking periods	130	(90)
Grading system	138	(96)
Weight of final exam	99	(69)
Passing grade	113	(79)
Calculation of class standing	70	(49)

Figure 1
Multiple Grading Criteria

Standards for an A Student	Standards for a F Student
o work is consistently recognized as showing comprehension of subject matter through ability to retain facts and principles learned	o is incapable of doing the work of his group or is not interested and makes little effort
o shows ability to apply subject matter learned to new problems	o takes little or no part in oral discussion
o organizes his/her work well	o written work is careless, untidy, inaccurate, or incomplete
o speaks clearly and forcibly in discussion	o span of attention is short
o presents neat, well organized, accurate, and complete work on time	o often absent from school
o performs required skills with a high degree of mastery	o has poor or no study habits (A F student doing his best may be given a D)
o completes both the average and the enriched assignment	
o has the power of analyzing his own work to discover his/her strong and weak points	
o has good study habits	
o shows marked initiative, industry, and attention	

Table 5
Extent of Direction Provided By Board Policies
(N=66)

	Policy Stipulates Practice		Policy Delegates Decision		Not Mentioned	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Frequency of marking period	28	(42)	13	(20)	25	(38)
Kind of symbol system	28	(42)	19	(29)	19	(29)
Definition of grade components	25	(38)	10	(15)	31	(47)
Conditions related to final exams	20	(30)	3	(5)	43	(65)
Effects of absences on grades	13	(20)	2	(3)	51	(77)
Computation of grade point average (GPA)	11	(17)	4	(6)	51	(77)

Note: Each policy may have more than one practice coded.

Table 6
Extent of School/Departmental Guidance/Direction in Grading

	School (N=116)		English Dept. (N=39)		Math Dept. (N=37)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
High - in which schools or departments provide explicit direction and formulas about criteria teachers should use in assigning grades (e.g., grade components, weighting of grades, and computation of grades)	7	(6)	4	(11)	2	(5)
Moderate - in which school and department guidelines suggest, but do not require, one or more of the grading criteria for teachers to consider in assigning grades -- not very extensive in terms of directions	46	(40)	32	(85)	33	(89)
Low - in which school and department guidelines provide no mention of criteria teachers should use in assigning grades (e.g., grade components, weighting of grades, and computation of grades)	63	(54)	2	(6)	2	(5)

APPENDIX A:

Board Policy - Highly Specific

MARKING SYSTEM

****

1. Mid-Marking Period Reports

Progress reports shall be issued to failing students and to those making minimal efforts. Reports may also be issued to students showing exceptional improvement.

Reports will be mailed home.

Any parent desiring a conference with a teacher may call the Guidance/Career Office

2. Report cards will be issued 4 times a year.

3. Grade Values

A. Grading Criteria

On report cards and permanent records, a letter grade will indicate the degree of the students' achievements based on the following criteria:

(1) Comprehension of subject matter and Skill development - as reflected in tests, quizzes, written and oral reports and projects, etc.

(2) Individual Initiative - as reflected in homework, logs, journals, classroom participation, etc.

B. Weight of Criteria (1) and (2) above:

These will be recommended by individual instructional Departments for approval by respective Supervisors, Management Team and Superintendent/Principal by May 30 preceding each school year.

The weight of Criteria (1) and (2) will be governed by the following ranges:

(1) Comprehension/Skill: 50 to 75%
(2) Initiative: 25 to 50%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Letter Grade	Performance	Percentage Range
A	Outstanding	93-100
B	Above Average	85-92
C	Average	77-84
D	Below Average	70-76
F	Failing	0-69
I	Incomplete	-
M	Medical Excuse (Phys Ed)	-
WF	Withdrawal/Failing	-
WP	Withdrawal/Passing	-

M, WF, WP grades have no credit values. M grades will be used in physical education only.

4. Computing Marking Period, Semester and Annual Grades

A. In computing individual Marking Period grades, the full percentage range (0-100%) may be employed, whereby the actual Percent grade earned will be used in averaging all components of the student's efforts and accomplishments.

B. In computing semester and annual grades each marking period, mid-year and final exam letter grade will be converted as follows to numbers for averaging purposes:

A = 4	C = 2	F = 0
B = 3	D = 1	

C. In a semester course (1/2 year) subject, the two (2) marking period grades and the exam will be of equal value - 1/3 (33 1/3%) each - in computing final grade.

In a full-year subject, the four (4) marking period grades, the mid-year, and the final will be of equal value - 1/6 (16 2/3%) each - in computing final grade.

The averaging of grades will, however, not apply under the following conditions:

(1) In a full-year course, a student who fails in 2 of the last 3 report grades (3rd & 4th marking periods and final examinations) will fail for the year, regardless of grade average for 1st and 2nd grade average for 1st and 2nd marking periods and mid-year exam.

(2) In a semester course, a student who fails in 2 of the 3 report grades (two marking periods and mid-year or final examination) will fail for the semester.

5. Mid-Year and Final Examinations

Formal mid-year and final examinations will be given in all subjects.

Mid-year examinations will cover the work for one semester.

Final examinations will cover the work for one semester in semester courses and for the entire year in full-year courses.

Mid-year and final examinations will be given equal time and scheduling considerations.

Mid-year and final examination grades are not to be included as part of marking period grades but are to be valued and averaged in the final grades as indicated in Section 4.

Exemptions: Students who perform well in full-year subjects will be exempted from final exams as follows:

a. Any Underclassman (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior) who has all A's for the 4 marking periods and the mid-year exam in any specific subject(s) will have the option of being exempted from the final exam in that subject(s) and will have an A recorded as the final exam mark.

b. Any Senior who has all A's or B's as grades for the four marking periods and the mid-year exam in any specific subject(s) will have the option of being exempted from the final exam in that subject(s) and will receive his average grade (A or B) as the final exam mark.

6. Standards for Promotion

Promotion, including graduation, is based on satisfying credit requirements. Homeroom assignment is determined by credits earned as follows:

From	To	No. of Credits Required
Grade 9	10	20
Grade 10	11	50
Grade 11	12	80
Grade 12	Graduation	115

No student will be placed in a senior homeroom (grade 12) unless all graduation requirements can be met by the June graduation date.

23 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Cheating has a two-fold definition:

A. Cheating has a two-fold definition:

1. Using "aids" not approved by the teacher in preparing any form of school work.

2. Submitting as one's work the work and/or answers of another person. Such work or answers are normally obtained through dishonest, deceitful or fraudulent means with or without the permission of the rightful owner.

A person aiding and abetting one who is cheating is also considered to be cheating.

B. The following procedures will be imposed whenever a student is found guilty of cheating:

1. Student will receive a zero for the assignment and have no opportunity to make it up for credit.

2. Teacher will notify student's counselor after each incident.

3. Guidance counselor will hold a conference with the student after each incidence.

4. Guidance counselor will notify parents whenever he/she deems necessary but not later than the second incidence.

C. Student may appeal any charges in accord with Policy 505: "Students' Rights to Appeal and Due Process".

8. Summer School

Student may attend an approved summer school for the purpose of making up a failing grade, improving a grade in a given subject (make up of credit deficiencies), or taking an enrichment course.

Actual grades earned in summer school will be recorded on permanent records along with the grade earned during the regular school year.

In the case of repeat courses, students will receive "credits" only once. Both grades, however, will be computed in class rank.

All repeat summer school courses will be weighted on the "B" level.

Course objectives, content, and standards of achievement must be consistent with those of the regular school year.

GUIDELINES REGARDING PROCEDURES FOR SUMMER SCHOOL MAKE-UP OF CREDIT DEFICIENCIES

Amount of Credit Deficiency	No. of Subjects Deficiencies Occurred	No. of Subjects Required to Make up Defi.	Summer School No. of Weeks Required to Attend
A. 1 to 5	1 or more	1	6
B. More than 5	2 or more	2	6
C. More than 10	Cannot make up more than 10 credits in Summer School. May attend Summer School as outlined in B to make up 10 credits.		

9. Tutoring

Students may also make up a failing grade in a course through a tutor certified by the State in the subject taught. All tutoring charges are the responsibility of the student.

A minimum of 6 hours of tutoring per credit is required.

Approval and arrangements for tutoring must be made through the student's guidance counselor prior to the close of school.

Course objectives, content, and standards of achievement must be consistent

The student's final grade will be based solely on the final examination which will be approved an administered by the Department Supervisor or Assistant.

The grade and credits earned and their computation in class rank and total credits will be recorded on the student's permanent record in the same manner as those for summer school. (See Section 8).

10. Makeup Work (Absence, Tardiness, Truancy, Suspension)

The student is responsible to see his teacher immediately upon return regarding the makeup of work missed during an absence.

Arrangements for makeup must be made by the student. All makeup work must be completed by the student within a period of time equal to the days missed. Additional time may be requested by the student.

To receive credit for quizzes, tests and other related work missed during the suspensions and excused absence or tardiness, the student must make up the work.

Such work, however, may not be made up for unexcused absences or tardiness, class cuts, or truancy. It will be recorded as a failing mark.

11. Class Rank, Valedictorian and Salutatorian

CLASS RANK

Class rank is calculated on student's quality point average which is determined by dividing his total number of quality points by the total number of credits carried on a letter grade (A,B,C,D,F) basis, all subjects, regardless of the number of credits they receive, will be considered for ranking purposes.

A two level weighted system is used to determine class rank. All subjects will be considered in computing class rank.

The basic assumption of such a weighted system is that it is more difficult to earn a higher grade in an above standard subject than it is in a standard subject. For example, an A in a standard class would be considered as easy to achieve as a "B" in an above standard class.

A two level weighted system offers additional quality points for grades earned in subjects classified as "A" level. All other subjects will be considered "B" level. The following illustrates the quality of each grade on each academic level.

Level A

Grade	Quality Points
A	5
B	4
C	3
D	2
F	0

Level B

Grade	Quality Points
A	4
B	3
C	2
D	1
F	0

SUBJECTS WITH WEIGHTED VALUE FOR CLASS RANK
(LEVEL A SUBJECTS)

Business
Stenography
Secretarial Office Practice
Accounting Office Practice

English
English IA, IIA, IIIA, IVA

Fine Arts
Music Theory
Career Art III, IV

Mathematics
Algebra I, II, III
Geometry
Trigonometry
Calculus and Ana. Geometry
Computer Science AI, AII
AIII, AIV

Science
General Science A
Biology A
Chemistry A
PSSC Physics A
Genetics

Foreign Languages
Spanish I, II, III, IV
French I, II, III, IV
Latin I, II, III, IV

Health and Physical Education
None

Home Economics
Human Relationship and Family Living

Industrial Arts
None

Social Studies
Environmental Geography A
American History to 1945A
American Government A
American Culture A
Recent American History A
Justice in America A
Introduction to
Psychology A
World History A
Anthropology A

Only subjects taken in grades 9-12 are used in determining class rank. All courses that are applicable toward graduation are considered. Failing as well as the passing marks are included.

The following is an example illustrating how grade point average is determined.

Student: John Jones - Grade 9

Level	Subject	Mark	Credit * weight	= value
A	English A	B	5 x 4	= 20.00
A	General Science A	B	5 x 4	= 20.00
A	Algebra I	C	5 x 3	= 15.00
A	French I	A	5 x 5	= 25.00
B	Phys Ed I	A	3.75 x 4	= 15.00
B	Health I	B	1.25 x 3	= 3.75
B	Freshmen Chorus	C	5 x 2	= 10.00
B	Band	B	5 x 3	= 15.00
			35 credits	123.75

123.75 ÷ 35.00 = 3.5357 Grade Point Average

Courses taken in grades 10, 11 and 12 will be evaluated in the same fashion as above with the totals being cumulative.

Class rank is computed on all students at the end of the junior year, mid-way through the senior year, and at the end of the senior year. The Principal is reserved the right to make the final determination.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. Auditing

Students may "Audit" classes in accord with the following guidelines:

A. Courses "audited" must go beyond the 30-credit minimum.

B. Regular classwork, homework and tests must be completed.

C. Pass/Fail grades and appropriate credit will be issued.

D. Changes in status of "Audit" courses (audit to regular and vice versa) must be made by the end of the first marking period.

E. Audit privilege limited to Seniors and Juniors only.

F. Deadline for adding or dropping Audit courses is the same as for regular courses.

G. One (1) course per semester is the maximum permitted.

H. Only those courses NOT required for graduation may be audited.

I. Audit courses will not be included in computing G.P.A. or Honor Roll status.

J. The course will be recorded on report cards and permanent record cards as an "Audit" course.

13. Withdrawal Failure/Withdrawal Pass from a Course

If a student drops a course four (4) weeks after entrance into the class, he/she is to receive a withdrawal failure (WF) or a withdrawal pass (WP) as a final average. The WF or WP will be recorded on his/her report card and his transcript. The dropped course is NOT computed in class rank and honor roll. A student who receives a WF or WP will not receive any credit for the course. Division Supervisor's and a WF or WP will not receive any credit for the course. Division Supervisor's and Department Assistant's recommendation will be required after a 4-week perio in addition to parent and counselor approval.

Deadlines for Student Schedule Changes

Unrelated Department Changes (example..Math to English)	
Year Long & First Semester Courses	Oct. 1
Second Semester Courses	Mar. 1
Departmental Level Changes (example..Science A to Science B)	
First Semester Course	Oct. 1
Year Long & Second Semester Courses	Mar. 1

14. Honor Roll

Honor roll lists will be announced following the close of each marking period. All subjects count in determining honor rolls.

Principal's List: Students who receive "A"s in all subjects will be placed on the Principal's List.

Honor Roll: Students who receive "B"s or better in all subjects will be placed on the Honor Roll.

Averaging of grades is not permitted.

GRADING/RATING

The Principal will consult with teachers selected that possess the necessary skills and abilities, to periodically review and make recomendations to change as necessary, the methods used for to evaluate and report student progress. The grading system shall be uniform at comparable grade levels and shall be both diagnostic and objective.

Date:

Legal References: N.J.A.C. 6:8-3.4(a) Assessment
N.J.A.C. 6:8-3.7(a) Evaluation of Pupil Progress

Cross Reference: 5124 Reporting to Parents

0911p

APPENDIX C:

School Guidelines - Highly Directive

Numerical values of letter grades approved by the Board of Education will be as follows:

A+	98-100	B+	87-89	C+	78-80	D	70-72
A	94-97	B	84-86	C	75-77	D-	effort grade
A-	90-93	B-	81-83	C-	73-74	F	below 70

Marks will be determined using an 80/20 formula directed to those items listed in each subject discipline.

ENGLISH/LANGUAGE ARTS

80%	20%
homework	attendance
tests	participation
research paper	preparation
quizzes	cooperation
writing samples	
oral book reports and projects	
book reports	
notebooks	

SOCIAL STUDIES

80%	20%
homework assignments	attendance
tests and quizzes	participation
research paper	preparation
oral reports	cooperation
notebooks	

SCIENCE

80%	20%
homework	attendance
tests	preparation
quizzes	participation
projects - oral, written	cooperation
laboratory reports	

MATHEMATICS

80%	20%
homework	attendance
tests	preparation
quizzes	cooperation
projects - oral, written	participation

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

80%	20%
tests	preparation
quizzes	participation
homework	attendance
knowledge of dialogues and daily assignments	cooperation

BUSINESS EDUCATION INDUSTRIAL ARTS HOME ECONOMICS

80%	20%
percents	participation
quizzes	cooperation
tests	preparation
reports - oral, written	attendance
homework	

Grade Point Scale		Honors Grouping	
A+	4.33	A+	5.63
A	4.00	A	5.20
A-	3.67	A-	4.77
B+	3.33	B+	4.33
B	3.00	B	3.90
B-	2.67	B-	3.47
C+	2.33	C+	3.03
C	2.00	C	2.60
C-	1.67	C-	2.17
D	1.00	D	1.30

Policy on Minimum Failing Grades

A teacher must weigh carefully the progress a student is making in deciding A Final Grade.

It is important for all teachers to keep a "student alive" in deciding a percent to be recorded as a failing grade for a marking period or semester. Weigh carefully those factors which may have caused failure. Look at student records. Analyze, schedule conferences with parents and or student and set goals and conditions from conference. Seek the assistance of Guidance Counsellors and Supervisors. I will not accept adding up tests, quiz and homework without implementing the steps mentioned above. It is more challenging to the student and you if the course can be changed, "Failure to Success". Therefore encouragement, prodding, short term goals and any other techniques must be implemented. Flexibility shall be part of the evaluation process.

A. The percent recorded should not be absolute which eliminates for a student any chance of passing if satisfactory progress is indicated and a sincere effort comes into play.

B. Evaluate total student performance. Don't decide by administering one test. If the marking period grades have been acceptable by your standards consider reasons why he may have failed Mid Terms or Final Exams.

C. If a student has one marking period with performance totally unacceptable while his other three marking periods give you a clear picture of his ability, weigh carefully the failing marking period. Could serious factors of family divorce, health, emotional trama etc. be the cause?

Policy on Minimum Failing Grades (continued)

D. When marking Mid Term and Final Exams grades review "distribution of grades". They are important! One cannot assume "It is the student's fault". or "They won't study". We as professionals share in the responsibility of failure.

E. Keep your options open

Flexibility, understanding or consideration should not be exercised if a student makes no attempt to be part of the learning process or makes no attempt to cooperate or be in attendance.

Supervisors and Building Principal will intervene if the above factors are not considered when determining Marking Period and Final Grades.

MARKING BOOKS

Marking Book becomes the official record for marks during any school year. Data collected by the teacher in evaluating the student needs to be accurate and recorded in an organized manner. It is important to have uniformity in recording and leave the evaluation of students to the professional staff, within the policies established. Therefore, the following is to be implemented:

1. Each teacher will permanently secure any code, or how credit is determined, weight of lab, extra project, weight of quiz, etc., on the inside cover of the Marking Book.

2. Teacher's name is to be listed on the cover and first page. If more than one book is used, post 1 of 2, 2 of 2, etc..

3. Complete information at the top of the page: period, course title and number, term (interpret as marking period), and year.

4. Students are to be listed in alaphabetical order—last name first. List only once for each course. Late enrollees: post date of entry into class.

5. Post month and date; Ex.: Sept. 3,4,5,etc.. The page to your left is to be used for attendance, tardiness, and basically the 20% items. Attendance and tardiness will be recorded by classes on the student's report card. Information will be provided by you by keeping accurate record of his/her attendance. Record the number of days in each marking period at the top of the page next to Code.

   1st Marking Period
   2nd Marking Period
   3rd Marking Period
   4th Marking Period

7th and 8th Grade cycles - check pages B-8 and B-11 of the Administrative Handbook.

6. Percentages are to be recorded each marking period in the columns labeled:

		ex.:	80%	20%	Mark %
Daily:	20% portion of the grade				
Period Test:	80% portion of the grade		62	28	90B
Average:	Percentage average for marking period				

Record percentage as computed. If for some reason in your professional judgement you wish to adjust any marks as an incentive for a particular student, and the percentage does not warrant the letter grade, note explanation on the summary page. Use an asterisk.

7. Changes in procedure will be permitted only with prior discussion with your Supervisor and final approval of the Principal.

Computing Final Grades

Yearly Courses:

1st M.P.	2nd M.P.	Mid-Term	3rd M.P.	4th M.P.	Final Exam	Total
20	20	10	20	20	10	100

Semester Courses:

1st M.P.	2nd M.P.	Final	Total
40	40	20	100

Cycle Courses:

Marking Pd.	Exam
80	20

Marking Book:

The back of the book provides for the recording of all percentage and letter grades by marking periods in addition to mid-term and final exams. Columns are clearly identified for all the above items, plus mid-term averages and final grades.

80 Percent Grade

.8 X 1 = .8
.8 X 2 = 1.6
.8 X 3 = 2.4
.8 X 4 = 3.2
.8 X 5 = 4
.8 X 6 = 4.8
.8 X 7 = 5.6
.8 X 8 = 6.4
.8 X 9 = 7.2
.8 X 10 = 8
.8 X 11 = 8.8
.8 X 12 = 9.6
.8 X 13 = 10.4
.8 X 14 = 11.2
.8 X 15 = 12
.8 X 16 = 12.8
.8 X 17 = 13.6
.8 X 18 = 14.4
.8 X 19 = 15.2
.8 X 20 = 16
.8 X 21 = 16.8
.8 X 22 = 17.6
.8 X 23 = 18.4
.8 X 24 = 19.2
.8 X 25 = 20
.8 X 26 = 20.8
.8 X 27 = 21.6
.8 X 28 = 22.4
.8 X 29 = 23.2
.8 X 30 = 24
.8 X 31 = 24.8
.8 X 32 = 25.6
.8 X 33 = 26.4
.8 X 34 = 27.2
.8 X 35 = 28
.8 X 36 = 28.8
.8 X 37 = 29.6
.8 X 38 = 30.4
.8 X 39 = 31.2
.8 X 40 = 32
.8 X 41 = 32.8
.8 X 42 = 33.6
.8 X 43 = 34.6
.8 X 44 = 35.2
.8 X 45 = 36
.8 X 46 = 36.8
.8 X 47 = 37.6
.8 X 48 = 38.4
.8 X 49 = 39.2
.8 X 50 = 40
.8 X 51 = 40.8
.8 X 52 = 41.6
.8 X 53 = 42.4
.8 X 54 = 43.2
.8 X 55 = 44
.8 X 56 = 44.8
.8 X 57 = 45.6
.8 X 58 = 46.4
.8 X 59 = 47.2
.8 X 60 = 48
.8 X 61 = 48.8
.8 X 62 = 49.6
.8 X 63 = 50.4
.8 X 64 = 51.2
.8 X 65 = 52
.8 X 66 = 52.8
.8 X 67 = 53.6
.8 X 68 = 54.4
.8 X 69 = 55.2
.8 X 70 = 56
.8 X 71 = 56.8
.8 X 72 = 57.6
.8 X 73 = 58.4
.8 X 74 = 59.2
.8 X 75 = 60
.8 X 76 = 60.8
.8 X 77 = 61.6
.8 X 78 = 62.4
.8 X 79 = 63.2
.8 X 80 = 64
.8 X 81 = 64.8
.8 X 82 = 65.6
.8 X 83 = 66.4
.8 X 84 = 67.2
.8 X 85 = 68
.8 X 86 = 68.8
.8 X 87 = 69.6
.8 X 88 = 70.4
.8 X 89 = 71.2
.8 X 90 = 72
.8 X 91 = 72.8
.8 X 92 = 73.6
.8 X 93 = 74.4
.8 X 94 = 75.2
.8 X 95 = 76
.8 X 96 = 76.8
.8 X 97 = 77.6
.8 X 98 = 78.4
.8 X 99 = 79.2
.8 X 100 = 80

PARTICIPATION, PREPARATION, COOPERATION

20 Percent

.2 X 1 = .2
.2 X 2 = .4
.2 X 3 = .6
.2 X 4 = .8
.2 X 5 = 1
.2 X 6 = 1.2
.2 X 7 = 1.4
.2 X 8 = 1.6
.2 X 9 = 1.8
.2 X 10 = 2.0
.2 X 11 = 2.2
.2 X 12 = 2.4
.2 X 13 = 2.6
.2 X 14 = 2.8
.2 X 15 = 3.0
.2 X 16 = 3.2
.2 X 17 = 3.4
.2 X 18 = 3.6
.2 X 19 = 3.8
.2 X 20 = 4
.2 X 21 = 4.2
.2 X 22 = 4.4
.2 X 23 = 4.6
.2 X 24 = 4.8
.2 X 25 = 5
.2 X 26 = 5.2
.2 X 27 = 5.4
.2 X 28 = 5.6
.2 X 29 = 5.8
.2 X 30 = 6
.2 X 31 = 6.2
.2 X 32 = 6.4
.2 X 33 = 6.6
.2 X 34 = 6.8
.2 X 35 = 7
.2 X 36 = 7.2
.2 X 37 = 7.4
.2 X 38 = 7.6
.2 X 39 = 7.8
.2 X 40 = 8
.2 X 41 = 8.2
.2 X 42 = 8.4
.2 X 43 = 8.6
.2 X 44 = 8.8
.2 X 45 = 9
.2 X 46 = 9.2
.2 X 47 = 9.4
.2 X 48 = 9.6
.2 X 49 = 9.8
.2 X 50 = 10.0
.2 X 51 = 10.2
.2 X 52 = 10.4
.2 X 53 = 10.6
.2 X 54 = 10.8
.2 X 55 = 11
.2 X 56 = 11.2
.2 X 57 = 11.4
.2 X 58 = 11.6
.2 X 59 = 11.8
.2 X 60 = 12
.2 X 61 = 12.2
.2 X 62 = 12.4
.2 X 63 = 12.6
.2 X 64 = 12.8
.2 X 65 = 13
.2 X 66 = 13.2
.2 X 67 = 13.4
.2 X 68 = 13.6
.2 X 69 = 13.8
.2 X 70 = 14
.2 X 71 = 14.2
.2 X 72 = 14.4
.2 X 73 = 14.6
.2 X 74 = 14.8
.2 X 75 = 15
.2 X 76 = 15.2
.2 X 77 = 15.4
.2 X 78 = 15.6
.2 X 79 = 15.8
.2 X 80 = 16
.2 X 81 = 16.2
.2 X 82 = 16.4
.2 X 83 = 16.6
.2 X 84 = 16.8
.2 X 85 = 17
.2 X 86 = 17.2
.2 X 87 = 17.4
.2 X 88 = 17.6
.2 X 89 = 17.8
.2 X 90 = 18
.2 X 91 = 18.2
.2 X 92 = 18.4
.2 X 93 = 18.6
.2 X 94 = 18.8
.2 X 95 = 19
.2 X 96 = 19.2
.2 X 97 = 19.4
.2 X 98 = 19.6
.2 X 99 = 19.8
.2 X 100 = 20

D- GRADE

Procedure: Issuing D- grade and in particular sequential courses

D- grade issued by an instructor is based on effort. All teachers, before issuing the D- grade, should carefully consider the following:

1. Examine the records, i.e., test scores, which include the C.A.T. and the D.A.T.;
2. Student performance;
3. Communication with the student as to their future courses;
4. Did the student make every effort to learn, i.e., extra help determination and sincerity;
5. After the teacher modified the subject matter (course) did the student complete his/her responsibility

D- is a passing grade and carries credit for the course (Grades 9-12)

D- grade will not be issued in Math or Foreign Language unless the student is a senior.

Question arises as to the next sequential course. We are all aware some courses can be modified for student success without compromising quality or integrity. Conversely, some subjects can only be mastered if a student passes the prior sequential course based on performance.

Understanding the problem, I am instructing Supervisors and Guidance Counselors - "Before a student is permitted to continue to the next sequential course, the following should occur:"

a. Contact the instructor issuing the D- for his/her recommendation;

b. Review records;

c. Review the content material included in the course or subject requested;

d. Make recommendations to the Principal for continuing to the next sequential course or a subject which the student can handle successfully.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX D:

Departmental Guidelines - Moderately Directive

ENGLISH

The following statement contains the general factors to be considered in determining English grades: The element of teacher subjectivity enters quite prominently in grading the English course particularly with regard to a student's competence in the various areas of English learning. This is a real barrier to a unified grading policy.

However, common areas are discernible among all English courses and can be included in a general statement of grading policy. The following criteria are used in the assessment of the student's grade:

- Class attendance — physical presence in class
- Class participation — evidence learning is taking place in class. This would include the student's attitude.
- Written homework assignments completed — a sufficient number to guarantee practice heeded to solidify class instruction.
- Quizzes based on home study — individual learning is tested on a frequent basis.
- Writing — creative and critical writing assignments.
- Major tests — measuring the success of learning on completing a unit of instruction.
- Special projects — individual application of concepts, such as book reports, research, etc.
- Extra credit assignments — at the discretion of the teacher provided all work is done.

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT

The Mathematics Department believes that the students should be encouraged to involve themselves in many different learning activities. A significant portion of the student's grade will be determined by their major tests which will be 60% of the grade. The homework that the students do will be 20% of the grade. The homework has a direct bearing on the tests because the tests reflect the contents of the homework assignments in mathematics. In order to accomplish proficiency in mathematics, homework supplies the practice essential to reinforcement of classroom instruction and theory. The third portion of the grade will be determined by their class participation which will be 20% of the grade. Class participation will involve the following areas: discussions, asking and answering questions, working individually on assignments in class, and putting homework problems on the board and explaining them to the class.